DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 761 HE 030 536

AUTHOR	Darling-Hammond, Linda; Sato, Nancy; Paine, Lynn; Snowball, Diane
TITLE	Professional Development: International and National Perspectives. Four Presentations from AAHE's National Conference on School/College Collaboration, 1993-1994.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1995-00-00
NOTE	58p.; Papers presented at the National Conference on School/College Collaboration (5th, Washington, D.C., November 17-20, 1994).
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; phone: 202-293-6440; fax: 202-293-0073.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Collegiality; *Comparative Education; Cooperative Programs; *Cultural Exchange; Educational Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; Foreign Countries; Foreign Culture; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *International Educational Exchange; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Effectiveness; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS	Australia; China; Japan

ABSTRACT

The four papers presented here address teacher development from an international viewpoint. In "Professional Development and Standards" (Linda Darling-Hammond) it is suggested that U.S. educators engage in new kinds of collaborations with universities, and it proposes a shift from information transmittal to "co-construction" of knowledge state From telling to facilitating. Next, "Reflections Derived From an Ethnographic Study of Japanese Elementary Schools" (Nancy Sato) warns that collaboration can be a double-edged sword, and notes that the separation of teacher and student roles and relationships is blurred in Japan, as is the separation between a teacher's personal and professional life. A similar context exists in China as we see from "Visions of Collegiality: Images from Teachers in China" (Lynn Paine). There teachers are part of an organization where working together is the fabric of their entire careers. The theme of "An Australian's Focus on Teaching and Learning Through Professional Development" (Diane Snowball), is the importance of continued teacher training for new teachers, noting that in Australia the purpose of assessment is to inform teaching. A brief section on the American Association for Higher Education and its Education Trust is appended. (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 761

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

FOUR PRESENTATIONS FROM AAHE'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SCHOOL/COLLEGE COLLABORATION, 1993-1994

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND
NA[illegible] TO
LY[illegible]NE
[illegible] SNOWBALL

[illegible] COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE 030 536

Professional Development:
International and National Perspectives

Four Presentations from AAHE's
National Conference on
School/College Collaboration, 1993–1994

Linda Darling-Hammond
Nancy Sato
Lynn Paine
Diane Snowball

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: INTERNATIONAL and NATIONAL PERSPECTIVES
Four Presentations from AAHE's National Conference on School/College Collaboration, 1993-1994

©1995 American Association for Higher Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

The opinions expressed in this collection are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the American Association for Higher Education or its members.

A publication of the Education Trust, AAHE. For more about AAHE and the Education Trust, see pages 49-53. Additional copies of this publication are available. For ordering information, contact:

Publications Orders
American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
Tel: 202/293-6440 x11 Fax: 202/293-0073

Contents

v
Introduction

1
Professional Development and Standards
by Linda Darling-Hammond

17
Reflections Derived From an Ethnographic Study of Japanese Elementary Schools
by Nancy Sato

27
Visions of Collegiality: Images From Teachers in China
by Lynn Paine

41
An Australian's Focus on Teaching and Learning Through Professional Development
by Diane Snowball

49
About AAHE

Introduction

Thinking Differently

It's hard to think and act differently even when what we are doing isn't working as well as it could. In an effort to put some new ideas in play in the education reform conversation, we turned to Linda Darling-Hammond because of her broad view of teacher development and to three speakers who could give us an international perspective on teacher development.

What we learned is that schools can be organized very differently from the way they are here; that an extended induction period for new teachers can be a serious commitment on the part of their schools and peers; and that the relationships of teachers to their peers, their teaching community, and others in their discipline at all school levels, can be significantly different from how they are in the U.S.

How should we use these different ideas? Each community and teacher, school, and higher education institution will have to decide for itself. However, there is much to gain from thinking about doing things differently. Hence, we present the following four speeches.

Linda Darling-Hammond reminds us that all of today's school reforms are looking for "infinitely skilled teachers" — teachers who can understand learning as well as teaching. She suggests that the way to accomplish this is to help teachers learn to figure out how to address the needs of their students as well as the demands of their disciplines. She says, "We need to help them learn to look at and listen to students as the basis for their knowledge, because understanding the learner is at least half the equation of moving that particular learner toward the curriculum goals we seek."

In Japan, we learn from Nancy Sato, the school context itself sets up conditions for professional development. Four aspects of the organizational context stand out for her: space and spatial arrangements, time, role definition and responsibilities, and the nature of human relations and relationship building. How fascinating it is to learn that in Japan teacher/student roles and relationships are not as bounded by space and time as in the United States. The separation between a teacher's personal and professional life is blurred.

In China, Lynn Paine tells us, it is similar. Once teachers become full-time, they enter an organization where working together is part of the fabric of their days, of their weeks, and of their entire career. Working together takes many forms — from informal arrangements to the formal organizational structure of the *jiaoyanzu*, or teaching research group. It is particularly interesting to note that the *jiaoyanzu* exists at elementary, junior,

and high schools.

Diane Snowball, former teacher and principal in Australia, recounts to us how important the revisiting of pedagogy and practice is to new teachers, regardless of what happens in the initial training of teachers. She says, "There's really quite a difference about what teachers notice when they're teaching."

Each speaker offers new ideas and ways of supporting teachers to improve student learning. We hope you find these speeches useful and that you can find a way to implement some of their ideas into your work. Do let us know how you use them.

Carol F. Stoel
Principal Partner, The Education Trust
American Association for Higher Education

Professional Development and Standards

by Linda Darling-Hammond

Linda Darling-Hammond is currently William F. Russell Professor in the Foundations of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, where she is also codirector of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST). She is actively engaged in research, teaching, and policy work on issues of school restructuring, teacher education reform, and the enhancement of educational equity. Dr. Darling-Hammond began her career as a public school teacher and was cofounder of a preschool and day care center. She is author or editor of six books, including Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession, A License to Teach: Building a Profession for 21st Century Schools, *and* Authentic Assessment in Action.

I've been asked to talk about the new standards we're trying to create for new forms of teacher knowledge. Related to this are needs for professional development that will help teachers acquire a deep knowledge of children and learning, rather than merely an implementation of curriculum frameworks or of specific techniques or programs.

We need to begin to define and expand successful strategies, and take very, very seriously our obligation to do that in the places where the inequalities of our society, systemic and deep and long-standing, make it less likely that those strategies will appear without our concerted efforts.

And we need to talk about the roles of higher education with schools in that undertaking, developing true partnerships, in which both parties learn and mutually restructure their work on behalf of children, on behalf of a set of more ambitious goals for learning that are pushing all of us to rethink our practices.

We need to invent and participate in new kinds of networks, joint research, collective study groups, teacher-to-teacher and school-to-school collaborations in which

---

*A presentation at AAHE's Fifth National Conference on School/College Collaboration, November 17-20, 1994, in Washington, DC. © American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; ph. 202/293-6440.

universities are supports and facilitators, rather than the "bearers of all wisdom" (maybe some, but not all). These include the creation of some new forms of higher education such as professional development schools for the preparation of new teachers, particularly in cities. I want to talk about these needs in the context of a redefinition of what schools are for.

Ellen Lagemann, my former colleague at Teachers College, now a professor at New York University, has suggested that if you want to understand the history of American education in the twentieth century, you need to understand that E.L. Thorndike won and John Dewey lost. That may be a uniquely Teachers College insight, because both of those individuals were at Teachers College for a period of time in the early-twentieth century. If you know that campus at all, you know that Thorndike Hall is a grand and glorious, modern-looking structure with things like working elevators and air conditioning in it, which is pretty high tech for us at TC. And Main Hall, which is where Dewey and other curriculum workers and teachers hung out, is quite old and keeps the echoes of much past glory and great thoughts but is not kept in nearly the spiffy repair as the place where tests were first invented and constructed.

The view of education that became dominant throughout this century was one that focused on behavioral prescriptions for teaching and learning.

What Lagemann meant is that the view of education that became dominant throughout this century was one that focused substantially on behavioral prescriptions for teaching and learning. These pertained to a limited conception of learning as the production of correct responses to fairly narrow kinds of questions on fairly simple, standardized tasks — and to a very limited conception of the demonstration of knowledge — as reflected on multiple-choice and norm-referenced tests. As you know, conceptions of knowledge are constricted not only by the forms of those responses but by the fact that on norm-referenced tests, questions to which too many, too few, or the wrong subset of respondents know the answers are thrown out, so that we don't really get a measure of a broad set of knowledge. We get from this process what is known as "discriminatory power" in both senses of that word.

It was a view in which the use of these types of assessment tools to sort and screen students for their places in life was initially accepted and became much of the rationale for the uses of assessment in schools. The purpose was not to be diagnostic and supportive of the learning process, in terms of figuring out what students know and how they think. The purpose was to determine how students ought to be slotted into curriculum opportunities of greater and lesser cost, requiring more and less skillful teaching.

This view represented a limited conception of teaching and teachers' knowledge, as well — one in which following techniques and routines was the major task of teaching, in

which teacher-proofing was the goal of much research. The effort was to find the "one best way" that material could be represented in curriculum packages that were highly structured. Some teacher-proof texts included not only the questions to ask of students at the end of the chapter, but the responses that students would presumably make, and then the responses that teachers in turn would make! These still exist in our schools, especially in our urban schools. They misrepresent learning. They misrepresent teaching. They give teachers flawed tools that don't work for them. And because of the belief that they would work, they often have prevented us from giving teachers the knowledge they need to really teach in ways that will be effective.

The current school restructuring movement is seeking, I think, to renew John Dewey's vision for education and teaching. It is a vision that is child-centered, that incorporates rich conceptions of learning for understanding and empowerment, that undertakes schooling for equality and responsibility, that sees teaching as based on knowledge of learners and learning. It is based on a commitment to children and a commitment to inquiry; on a commitment to continually finding ways to ensure that students succeed, rather than to merely implementing a set of routines and giving a grade, which I think accurately characterizes much of the now-waning twentieth-century view of teaching.

"The current school restructuring movement is child-centered.

The new standards that all of us are engaged in trying to bring to life embody this view of learning and the kind of powerful knowledge that kids ought to have. They embody an assumption that teachers will have the tools to figure out how to identify the varied pathways to a common conception of knowledge that students will need in order to move from the variety of places in which they start in their learning — with various language backgrounds, community and cultural backgrounds, kinds of prior knowledge and experience, and conceptions and misconceptions from which they must construct their understandings. Ensuring that teachers will have the tools to understand all of those things about their students and find the variety of pathways that are needed for each of them to move toward common high standards is very, very difficult and challenging work.

As those of us who are currently teaching in higher education know, it is as difficult and challenging to do that for our students in colleges and universities as it is for teachers to do that in K-12. I have personally taught or been a teacher's aide at the preschool, elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, and graduate school levels, and I have seen the different approaches that are needed to work with students' development across that span. But I have also seen the similarities. I need to be as learner-centered as a teacher of graduate students, as sensitive to their learning styles and needs, as I had to be when I was working in the lower grades if I want them all to succeed, if I see my job as a

developmental job, not as simply the giving of information and the giving of grades.

And that's a challenge for all of us: As we create partnerships with elementary and secondary schools, we need to be modeling in higher education the constructivist teaching we want future teachers to engage in. All of us must be providing for prospective and current teachers experiences that are hands-on, responsive to their learning needs, contextualized, and so on, in the same way we hope they will provide such experiences to their students. One does not learn to teach for understanding, to teach in an active learning context, by having been exposed to sixteen years of lectures. It's a challenge for all of us.

New standards for students imply a very different relationship between teachers and their knowledge base. New standards presume that because students are not standardized and their needs cannot be met by prescriptions for practice, a trickle-down theory of knowledge will not be able to guarantee success for all students. We now know enough about learning to know that almost no student fits the mold upon which standardized prescriptions for practice are based. This means that knowledge must be used to inform teachers' judgments, not to control their actions.

In past educational policies, the production of knowledge was viewed as a process in which researchers would figure out the one best answer to a question of educational practice, and that would be handed to textbook writers and test creators and administrators and policymakers, to encode in various materials and requirements that teachers would implement. This strategy was based on the presumption that there was one right way to teach, and if you used it, all students would learn. Now that we know that is not true, it means that teachers and researchers together have to be able to coconstruct knowledge that is in the hands of teachers, that is intended to inform their practice in very sophisticated ways.

We must also attend to a rich view of learning. As Maxine Green puts it:

> *My interest is in teaching, and teaching for me has to do with releasing people to learn how to learn. It has to do with possibilities and personal discoveries, with events in experience, with the making of connections, with the opening of doors. I want to see teachers being enabled to create the kinds of situations that provoke students to reach beyond themselves. Indeed, to become so concerned about posing questions and seeking answers and working things out that they cannot but act on their own initiatives, and, in time, begin teaching themselves.*

This is a different vision from one that is directed at imparting and testing the recall of information. It is directed at empowering learners, whether they are adult learners or children who are building the capacity to "work things out" throughout their lives.

So the desires of all of today's school reformers — for schools that can educate students to higher levels of performance, that can also accommodate and celebrate student

diversity — require what Larry Cremin once called "infinitely skilled teachers," — that is, teachers who can understand learning as well as teaching.

I think this conception of teaching is very, very key in how we think about professional development for teachers. The foundation that has been absent from much of teacher preparation and inservice professional development is helping teachers understand learning: how it unfolds and the many pathways it takes. We have trained teachers, and I use the word *trained* deliberately here, as though we were training doctors in the techniques of heart surgery without ever having given them a grounding in anatomy and physiology. We have provided them with little or no understanding of what it is they're trying to work with.

At root, we need to prepare teachers to deeply understand learning in the ways it typically unfolds, and in the ways it unfolds differently for different people. We need to help them figure out how to address the needs of their students as well as the demands of their disciplines. We need to help them learn to look at and listen to students as the basis for their knowledge, because understanding the learner — looking and listening to figure out what the learner knows and brings to the situation — is at least half of the equation of moving that particular learner toward the curriculum goals we seek.

In order to do this, students need to be engaged in active learning and extensive discussion of ideas. This both allows students to express their thinking in order to better formulate their thinking, as Vygotsky suggested, and it allows teachers to watch students in action, to document what they perceive about students' understanding while they are also thinking about the demands of the discipline and of the learning goals that are encapsulated in new standards.

So, the two sides of the equation, the learner and the demands of the discipline, need to be brought into connection. And that dialectic, that process, is a very complex undertaking that can be informed by theory and by research. But it must also be developed at the nexus of theory and practice, in the context of teaching and learning, or it never comes alive.

Developing this kind of teaching will require much more investment in the capacity of teachers to evaluate their work, to appraise their actions, to look at children, to anticipate and control consequences, to incorporate new theory and research, to possess skills and understanding needed to explain their work to other teachers and to students and their parents. As Gary Fenstermacher puts it:

> *These reflective capacities are not innate to human beings. Nor are they acquired quickly. They are not acquired during a planning period sandwiched somewhere in between classes or during evening mini-courses after a full day's work. They are rather the outcome of sustained and rigorous study in dialogue and exchange with master teacher educators, members of faculties of schools, schools of education,*

professional development schools, and elsewhere.

To provide these opportunities for reflective learning, we have to reimagine learning opportunities for teachers within the context of universities, within the context of schools, and in those spaces we create at the nexus of schools and universities in the variety of partnerships, networks, and activities that we share.

Obviously, we're talking about different approaches to sharing and using knowledge — approaches that enable teachers to make complex decisions, rather than trying to hand them pat answers to oversimplified problems, and approaches that allow teachers to continually ground what they learn in their practice. Capacity-building efforts will need to view knowledge as constructed by and with practitioners for use in their own contexts, rather than as something that is aimed at top-down implementation.

The context within which we need to do this work is one that requires substantial structural overhaul. Teaching in the United States, in contrast to many other countries, has historically been viewed as low-paid, semi-skilled work, easily managed by routines and external procedures. Teachers in this country work in factory-model schools, where they see large groups of students, one after another. And we are going backwards right now with respect to creating conditions within which teachers can do the hard work we're asking them to do. At a meeting earlier this week I was talking with a teacher from Los Angeles, where the typical class load is now 38.5 students per class period, with a load of five or six periods a day. She sees 193 students daily, in a schedule that allows her something like forty-three minutes a day for planning and preparation and meeting with students and calling parents. There is no time at all for professional development. And policymakers are saying to her, "Take these students, maintain this schedule, and meet these new high standards. God bless you. Good luck."

That structure for teaching work was explicitly modeled on the factory assembly line, with the idea that the students would move past the teacher in large blocks, one after another, and the teacher would stamp them with a lesson as they move by on a conveyor belt in forty-three-minute blocks. By contrast, in other countries, such as Japan, China, Switzerland, Germany, and France, most high school teachers meet with large groups of students for about fifteen or twenty hours a week. They spend the other twenty or twenty-five hours a week working with colleagues, planning, collaborating on the development of curriculum and assessments, meeting with parents, doing home visits, working individually with students who are falling behind, and all of the other things that make those hours in the classroom productive.

They are paid more in relation to the members of other professions, and there are more of them. One striking illustration is a comparison of the staffing and expenditure patterns of the schools in Zurich, Switzerland, with those in Riverside, California. The two districts serve approximately the same number of students with basically the same per-

pupil expenditures. However, the schools in Zurich have twice as many teachers as those in Riverside and one tenth as many administrative staff. And the Swiss teachers have smaller pupil loads and more time to work with one another because the district invests in teachers rather than peripheral personnel.

Because we've assumed that teachers are semi-skilled, and all of the decisions and inspection systems have to occur outside of the classroom, we have reached the point that only half of the people who work in K-12 education are teachers. (There is one administrative staff person for every 2.5 teachers.) And of the 50 percent who are teachers, just over half are actually classroom teachers who take primary responsibility for students.

To support teaching we need to transform the structures of schools, as many school/university collaborations and professional development schools are doing. They are restructuring the way schools organize schedules and people in order to find time for teacher learning. They are using time in different ways and investing more in teachers than in all of the peripheral offices around the edges of the classroom. We need to invest a great deal more in the preservice education of teachers, as well. Teacher education on most campuses commands fewer resources than those spent on the education of students in any other major department or professional school. Much of the tuition that teachers pay supports the education of engineers, accountants, philosophy majors, lawyers, and so on. And in school districts, less than one half of one percent of revenues is spent on professional development.

In order to make progress, those of us who are working toward reform must be able to think broadly and structurally about change, as well as about the contexts of our particular programs and projects.

We must also address the fact all of those resources, as minimal as they are for teacher learning, are often denied entirely to the teachers who teach minority and low-income students in central cities and poor rural schools. Right now, of the 200,000 teachers coming into elementary and secondary education each year, about 10 percent are entering without any preparation to teach and another 15 percent with substandard licenses. They are trying to teach without having had the advantage of preparation in child development, learning theory, or pedagogy. They may be teaching out of their field of preparation, as are one third of newly hired math and science teachers.

Most of these underprepared teachers are in low-income central city schools. Many of them last for only a year or two. So, the children in these schools experience a parade of short-term, inexperienced, underprepared teachers, one after another, year after year.

People who are serious about education know that what the teacher knows and does is what counts — that teachers are not interchangeable cogs in the wheel. As a parent, you may say, "I can get my kid through one bad year with a teacher." Although as a parent, I suspect you say, "I am going to be at the door the first day of school to get this assignment changed." But imagine if your child had poorly prepared teachers year after year after year,

sometimes two or three or four teachers in a year, because they don't even last throughout the school year. What that would mean for his or her education?

In those same districts, the rich opportunities for professional development that are available in our more affluent school districts are also denied. So, in those areas where teachers are coming in without initial preparation, they are also least likely to get any additional form of professional development to help them learn how to meet the even more extensive needs of a variety of children well. The rich get richer, and the poor get poorer in terms of learning for teachers, which translates into learning for children. That's the real genesis of the "Bell Curve." But that's another speech that I cannot give today.

As we take up the issue of school/university collaborations and the building of professional capacity to meet the needs of children, we must understand that we are working in a deeply unequal, deeply disparate situation where some school districts in this country spend $20,000 per child and some spend $2,000. It is a situation in which salaries for teachers are similarly unequal, so that recruitment of qualified teachers is unequal, a situation in which many people are entering teaching who are not prepared to teach. At the same time, ironically, only about 50 or 60 percent of those who are prepared to teach actually go on into teaching. So, we are meanwhile preparing a lot of people who are not entering the profession.

The challenge for those of us who are in schools that prepare teachers is to figure out a way to connect the recruitment, preparation, induction, and training of teachers in ways that are coherent and that get teachers well prepared for the places where the jobs are. Helping to bring about that coherence is one way that school/university partnerships can become critically important in poor rural and urban districts. Without intervention, planning, and collaboration, we are likely to prepare teachers for jobs where there are already surpluses of teachers rather than for jobs where they are most needed.

Clearly, systemic reform requires major capacity-building efforts throughout the system. How do people learn new ways of doing their jobs in the education system? In the past, we have had three main approaches. The first is professional development, usually called "training," which means either workshops on specific topics or university courses on just about anything, for credit that translates into salary increases. The second is to identify and validate successful practices and disseminate them via written materials and workshops so that others can replicate them. The third traditional approach is to send in experts, usually in the context of school failure, to "fix" what is wrong.

All three approaches rest on assumptions about learning that directly contradict the paradigm on which systemic reform is based. They assume that teachers learn in ways that students don't learn — through "teaching as telling" and the transmission of information that is disconnected from the problems of practice that teachers face every day. The workshop training model of professional development, the replication model of school change, and the outside expert approach all rest on the same principles of learning as the

one-right-answer authority-dispensing information view of teaching and learning. Although each approach can have value in certain limited circumstances, none of them can by itself meet the capacity-building challenges that we face.

We need to rethink our assumptions about how adult learning occurs and about how schools improve in the same way that we have shifted from instruction to construction in our understanding of student learning. We must rethink our models of preparation and professional work so that instead of relying on expert advice, they acknowledge how professionals do learn from one another, within and across schools, based on principles of collaboration in their construction of new understandings.

What teachers need to be able to do to meet ambitious new standards and outcomes for students will require them to understand a variety of strategies for instruction and how to make those available to very diverse learners in schools that are growing increasingly diverse each day. That means they must use a range of teaching strategies, not any one single method, which challenges many of our traditional professional development strategies that teach one method for lesson planning or instruction or classroom management.

There was an article in *Educational Leadership* several years ago that listed the ten highest-paid providers of staff development to schools. I won't tell you who they were, but I will tell you that each of them had a single model, five-bullet or seven-bullet approach that could be conveyed in a one-day workshop at $10,000 or $20,000 a pop, to three thousand teachers gathered in a stadium. University-based learning, school-based learning, and school/university collaborative work were not represented among the top ten. I think we are moving away from that approach, but it will demand invention on all of our parts, in a context in which we also are trying to bring about new structures for schools and new structures for adult learning.

In addition, we need new standards for teaching. There is currently no coherent continuum of teacher development. A lot of discontinuity and conflict lies in various state, district, and school visions of what good teaching is and what teachers do as these are reflected in teacher education, state licensing, teacher evaluation, and ongoing professional development. Teacher evaluation systems and teacher licensing systems still cling in many cases to an outmoded view of teaching and learning as the delivery of information to passive recipients. Schools of education have a variety of viewpoints. And at various points along the way, teachers are told in school system directives: Now do it this way, now do it that way.

As we work to build knowledge for teaching, one of the things we need to do is to develop a vision of what accomplished teaching is for the kinds of learning we want from students. And then we must figure out how teachers can become accomplished in these ways. As Lewis Carroll's Cheshire cat said, "If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there." And that's about where we have been with respect to standards

for teaching until quite recently.

There is a new set of tools to help in this regard. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which was established just a few years ago as the very first professional body in teaching to define accomplished teaching, has been working with many of the same organizations that are producing new standards for students. The Board is articulating standards for teachers at the early childhood, middle childhood, adolescent, and young adulthood levels in subject matters ranging from mathematics to science to social studies and history. These initial standards have been translated into authentic assessments of teaching that are spectacular examples of what assessment can become. Teachers engage in a year-long process of developing a portfolio of their work, of examining student work and learning, of reflecting on learning events and sharing videotapes of their teaching, all of which are evaluated for advanced certification as an accomplished teacher.

These standards and assessments are proving to be powerful tools in preservice and inservice education for teachers. They are linked to the learning suggested in the student standards. They give vivid examples of what appropriate and accomplished practice looks like and is. They incorporate the knowledge base about learning generally as well as about learning in the disciplines. And they prove to be exceedingly motivating for teachers who say that when they have engaged as an assessee or an assessor in this process, it has been the most powerful professional development they have even experienced.

Teachers' learning is contextualized in their practice because they are working with their classes as they are trying to work toward these standards. And university/school partnerships are developing ways to help teachers begin to use these new professional standards in their ongoing, daily practice, as well as in seeking board certification.

The National Board standards have also been linked to standards for licensing through the efforts of more than twenty states participating in the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the INTASC standards are further translated into the new NCATE standards for teacher education approval. These efforts provide a basis for coherence in the system.

The major point of all this for our work in collaboratives is that there are efforts under way to define teaching, teacher learning, teacher assessment, and the practice of teaching in ways that are supportive of the goals we have for students, rather than at odds with those goals, which I would argue most of the current policies for teaching currently are.

Many other teacher evaluation and teacher development systems are grounded in conceptions of teaching that will work against teachers' capacity to meet the new standards. In Florida, for example, teachers who experience the Florida performance measurement system are marked down for taking into account the personal needs and experiences and perceptions of their students as they're working toward curriculum goals,

although that's absolutely essential for building a base on which learning can occur. In the behavioral view of learning on which the evaluation system is based, paying attention to students' views and experiences could detract from the pace of the lesson. The pace is defined by how fast the teacher can "cover" the material. Or as Al Shanker once put it, in the information transmittal view, the way to increase productivity in education is to talk faster.

We have come to understand what does work in good professional development in recent years. There are several important features:

First, teachers are engaged in work, with one another and with folks in university partnerships and collaboratives, that is focused primarily on students and their learning rather than on particular techniques and tools of teaching.

Second, good professional development is experiential. It engages teachers in concrete tasks of observation, teaching, and reflection that illuminate the processes of learning and development and the contribution of various experiences and approaches. Teachers come together to discuss their work. Sometimes coursework is constructed to allow them to bring in samples of student work or the portfolio assessments that they are developing or the questions that they are encountering as they move toward the use of the NCTM standards or other new standards. They bring their own and students' work to that discourse as it is occurring in their local contexts, rather than just hearing in the abstract what the principles of practice might be.

Third, teacher learning opportunities are grounded in inquiry and experimentation that are participant driven. They are engaged in research and inquiry in the classroom and the school around those areas of work that are pushing toward new forms of teaching and learning.

Fourth, these opportunities are collaborative and interactional. They involve a sharing of knowledge among educators. They are connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students. They are sustained, ongoing, and intensive. They take place over a long period of time, supported by modeling, coaching, and collective problem solving around specific problems of practice.

In these forums, teachers, like students, are learning by doing, by reflecting, by collaborating, by sharing. Those strategies that move us a great distance beyond the direct teaching of most school systems' workshops have been supported in a variety of networks, collaboratives, and partnerships of all kinds across the country. They include such efforts as the Bay Area (now national) Writing Project, the Urban Mathematics Teacher Collaboratives, the teacher research projects that are going on with university and school-based faculty conducting research together. They include the collaborative work on standards writing, standards setting, and assessment that is going on in Vermont, New York, Delaware, and many other states.

One example of such a collaboration has been launched by the State University of

New York, which has begun a set of pilot projects between SUNY campuses and high schools to develop portfolios in mathematics, science, and technology that reflect New York's new standards for high school graduation and that can be used as students enter the university system, as well. The SUNY system has called for an assessment file that students will bring with them when they move into higher education. The campuses hope to continue use of these portfolios through college to build evidence about student learning.

These collaboratives are powerful in a number of ways. They are powerful because people are coming together across boundaries to ask "what constitutes good work?" This creates an external referent to the school. It is high school teachers and university professors together saying, "what do we collectively think constitutes good work in this field?" They are developing means to look at this question using authentic assessments. This provides an external referent for high school teachers and a learning experience for the college-level teachers, because they are able to work directly with high school students and look at how the learning process and the assessment process unfold. And these efforts are beginning to inform assessment in the higher education setting, producing ways to look at what students know and can do that give a richer, broader, more in-depth picture, and that also force teachers and students together to get under the surface, to go after more challenging forms of learning.

Collaboratives are powerful because people come together across boundaries to ask what constitutes good work?

Another related project of standards and assessments is the work of New York City elementary school teachers with the Primary Learning Record, which comes from Great Britain. It is a tool that helps teachers learn to look at students' literacy development and to work with parents to document that development systematically. The record is built on work samples, systematic analyses of student reading, and other observations of students at work. Lehman College is supporting that work through its Institute for Literacy Studies by convening study groups of teachers to come together a couple of times a month to share what they are learning about their practice, to ask questions, and to dig deeper. Meanwhile, those in the university setting are learning, too, about what helps teachers learn, so that they can deepen and inform their work in the university.

Other school/university partnerships are working around more general issues of school restructuring. They help to legitimate change and to facilitate new approaches to teaching and learning. The University of Louisville, for example, began a process some years ago of stimulating the development of dozens of professional development schools across Jefferson County in conjunction with the Gheens Academy. These schools have engaged in rethinking student standards, curriculum, pedagogy, in collaboration with each

other and with the university around a set of commitments that all children can learn. They are working now to demonstrate with concrete, visible outcome measures that collective reflection between and across the schools and university has paid off, and that children are learning to much higher standards in a variety of settings where traditional assumptions about the structuring of pedagogy and teaching have also been challenged.

In a variety of ways, schools and universities can energize each other to do this work, both because they share many commitments and concerns and because they are different in the ways they function. An external force and external conversation transforms the internal conversation. I doubt that there is anyone here who believes that we can be standing still in K-12 education or in higher education in terms of how we conceive the teaching and learning process, how we conceive our pedagogy, or how we conceive our purposes. So the creation of the rub between theory and practice, the creation of an energy across those boundaries, helps both of us to rethink in a much more holistic way what we are doing and what we are after.

This is essential if, in fact, we're committed to an education for democracy, one that really takes seriously the facilitation of learning as the major purpose of education. This is, I believe, a new purpose for education. It is not the basis on which we have structured our work in this country in the past. Education provided an opportunity to gain information, but the burden was on the student to learn in whatever limited ways the information might be presented, rather than on the teacher to truly teach — to struggle with the dilemmas of how to make learning accessible to the student.

We must shift from information transmittal to co-construction of knowledge, from telling to facilitating.

That dilemma is what we are confronting as our society recognizes that all people, children and adults, have to learn to much higher levels. This means that schools are not just a sorting and selecting institution.

My first shock when I joined the higher education community was learning that the term "raising standards" is generally used to mean raising admissions requirements. That is, we raise standards by letting in people who can teach themselves more easily, but we do not worry about transforming our own practice to ensure that the learners who we have in our institution are enabled to learn more effectively. The same conversation can be heard in secondary schools when the idea of raising standards is discussed.

I think that presumption may be beginning to change, but I think it is a presumption about schooling that has been deeply rooted in our history and traditions. We must come to understand that if we are raising standards for learning, then we are raising standards for ourselves. We are raising standards for teaching. We are demanding more of ourselves on behalf of those who look to us for guidance and for the path.

So, what's different about the work that we are now engaging? As we seek to transform schools so that they work for all children, we also have to transform the ways in which we help schools with that task by moving from an outside expert model to one in which we are partners in learning. We must shift from information transmittal to co-construction of knowledge, from telling to facilitating. And in higher education, we have to think about how to make that shift, as well — how to ensure active, collaborative, experiential learning for all of our students, not just those who become teachers, so that they can learn more effectively.

I have to tell a tale on myself, because like everyone, I engage in a career-long struggle to improve my teaching. In a policy course this last semester, I engaged students in a process in which, in a group, they had to develop a policy proposal and then present it to a legislature or a school board of their peers for critique and questioning. This set of exhibitions went on throughout the last part of the term; the power of students' engagement in their active learning was such that at the end of the term, all of the groups continued to work for two to three additional weeks to revise their policy proposals based on the feedback they had gotten from their colleagues in the classroom. And I experienced in the most powerful way what happens when you energize learning for the sake of learning in the pursuit of an intrinsically satisfying goal. The answer is: The semester doesn't end. The boundaries come down, the learning continues, and so do the demands on teaching and teachers. And that is as it should be.

As we take on higher standards for ourselves, which is what I think we must do to enact higher standards for students, we must also be prepared for the fact that when people start to learn because it is meaningful to them, there is no end to it. And our work gets bigger, forcing us to change pedagogy, to change our programs, and to change our purposes.

I want to close with a comment from Manuel Gomez on school/university collaborations, who wrote a response to Vito Perrone in the newsletter published by the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. Vito presented a long history of the collaborations between schools and universities that have existed over more than a century. In his response, Gomez suggests that the fundamental question we should be asking as we consider collaboration with K-12 schools is how we can provide more critical support to our teachers and young people.

> *If higher education is to remain vital, we must respond to the problems of our society. And as the experience of cooperative agricultural extension programs has demonstrated, the greatest contributions of universities to society's problems require mutuality and collaboration. The current educational partnership movement enables colleges and universities to make profound contributions to schools, teachers, students, families, and communities, but the institutional structures, values, and*

incentives of educational institutions K-16 must change to make this important responsibility a reality.

So, I think our work has to look to the roots of the matter. It has to look for all of the small and large ways we can contribute to professional development for ourselves and for colleagues in all schools. It needs to pay particular attention to the places where the need is acute, where our contributions as school and university-based teachers are desperately needed. We are going to need to be inventive in this work. We are going to have to imagine new systems and institutions and approaches, as well as new kinds of content for the workshops and courses and study groups and research teams that we invent in the process.

I believe if we approach this work with an inventive stance and with commitment, if we find ways to join hands, we can make an historical contribution to strengthening education for democracy, to creating an education for freedom for all students. □

Reflections Derived From an Ethnographic Study of Japanese Elementary Schools

by Nancy Sato

Nancy Sato is currently the project director for research on the role of teacher learning communities in educational reform efforts; working with Milbrey McLaughlin and Joan Talbert. Her research post follows a three-year stint in Japanese elementary schools as part of her dissertation research. She received her PhD in social studies education at Stanford University. Prior to graduate school, she worked for seven years at the Boston Children's Museum, coordinating and teaching in its desegregation programs with the Boston Public Schools and working as its multicultural developer. And, for four years she directed an after-school program in Chinatown for mostly immigrant students.

I was very struck by Linda Darling-Hammond's plenary speech. Some of her points were exactly those that I found so compelling in Japan and in the Japanese elementary schools I was observing. She mentioned such things as the importance of modeling, having teachers directly experience the same kind of learning process and environment that you would want to promote for your children and students; reflective practice, the collective construction of teaching and learning, and its importance for all of us as teachers and learners; and finally, examining the conditions of teaching that both enable and constrain our work, including the role that collaboration can play.

On the other hand, the Japanese case, which is very much imbued in collaboration, also reveals how collaboration is a double-edged sword, as you can probably imagine. It can save time and energy, but it can consume more time and energy as well. However, in the long run, Darling-Hammond's argument about the increased energy and insights that

---

*A presentation at AAHE's Fifth National Conference on School/College Collaboration, November 17-20, 1994, in Washington, DC. © American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; ph. 202/293-6440.

we can gain through school and university collaborations can be extended to include the kinds of energy and insights we could gain if we learned more about and collaborated more with other countries.

Between Cultures

When I was heavily engaged in a completely different cultural context, new windows were opened both about myself and my own country, which is America. Although I may look "Japanese" to you, once you know a little bit about my background, you will understand how much I needed to learn to be able to do research in Japan.

I grew up in St. Louis, Missouri, and the only language I ever heard spoken was English. My mother is Chinese-American and my dad is Japanese-American, so they only spoke English to each other and I grew up a good Midwestern jock. There was no difference between China and Japan, as far as I was concerned. So, you can tell that there was a big learning experience I had to go through, and I have found it has been quite valuable in continuing to open my eyes to new perspectives on teaching, learning, and schooling in America.

Linda brought up another point I wanted to mention today but did not know how: She said that at Teachers College, Thorndike won but Dewey lost. Well, in Japan, Dewey won.

Observing in Japan such rich activities and priorities placed on experiential learning, both for teachers and students, I asked the teachers about their educational philosophy and where their ideas came from, assuming it was from long tradition, but ironically, they would look at me somewhat surprised, laugh, and say, "We got it from you. This is from John Dewey." Other American researchers who have also studied Japanese elementary schools have noted similar experiences. So, at least Dewey is alive and well somewhere.

Looking at this "professional development for educators" booklet from the National Governors Association, I was also struck that several of its proposed new approaches (similar to several current reform efforts) are also practices commonplace in Japan. Please think about it as I describe some examples from Japan: the encouragement of professional growth throughout one's career; the idea of life-long learning; defining professional development as an ongoing and integral part of school operations, not an add-on separate from your daily life work; overcoming isolation and encouraging networking, mutual support, and professional consultation; and finally, professional development designed at the school building level or district level, responsive to the local issues.

Reinventing Practices

The point of today's presentation is not to set up another comparison. I think that many times when references to "the Japanese" are invoked, it has actually detracted in two main ways from the rich potential of mutual conversations that should be happening.

First, I think that Japanese components, both good and bad, often are taken out of their context, presented as though a single practice could produce the same results, when it is a highly complex, articulated nexus of checks and balances that makes any one particular facet work.

Second, and most important, is that international comparisons of Japan versus America versus the U.K., and so on actually set up false dichotomies. In fact, when I think about the good classrooms that I've gone into in America, many features of those classrooms are the same as those I observed in the Japanese case.

It just seems that the Japanese have been more systemic and are able to do it on a more widespread basis. And I think the primary reason is that the ability to change and grow, both individually and as a group, is built into the conditions of their teaching context. The point is really to stimulate new ways of thinking. Again, do not generalize too much from my experience, drawn from just several Japanese elementary schools. In Japan, there is a variety of instantiations of any one example I will present, and a diversity of opinions about them. I'm selecting some highlights because they provided new visions for us. The selections are tailored to some of the concerns that I've heard at this conference so far.

So, in examining these teacher professional communities and schools in other cultures I hope that we can not only challenge our perceptions of ourselves and of other cultures but also raise questions about what we assume to be "given" in our own culture. To reinforce our confirmation in the things we are doing well, and to reinvent our practices informed by the diversity of others. In many ways, I felt that the conditions Japanese teachers face are not so different from those faced by U.S. teachers.

Japanese Professional Development Landscape

Japanese schools are organized by age level progression, which means there is no retention, no ability grouping, no skipping grades. Therefore, teachers face widely diverse achievement levels in classrooms, and I don't think that is so unusual, as those of you who have been teachers well know.

Teachers there have to collaborate with their colleagues, and yet they are all constantly striving to maintain their personal integrity, freedom, and creativity. They have too much content to teach and too little time. They get contradictory messages and pressures from the federal government, parents, and the universities. And they want more local autonomy. They feel an increasing loss of respect from students, parents, and the government officials. They are always consciously having to strive for equity and egalitarian concerns amidst conditions that promote hierarchical, status-conscious relations ... conditions that, I think, sound a little familiar.

Today, I will focus on features of the Japanese professional development landscape that are embedded in teachers' daily work lives. There is a whole set of professional

development mechanisms (district and university inservice programs) that are pretty much the standard fare of the one-shot workshops, which I won't go into today. I really was more intrigued by how the school context itself sets up conditions for professional development, and that is what I will elaborate now.

The two major areas of this context that stood out for me were the organizational context and the cultural context that these organizational practices sit within.

Organizational Context

Four aspects of the organizational context stand out: space and spatial arrangements, time, role definition and responsibilities, and the nature of human relations and relationship building. They reveal assumptions about and implications for professional development and teacher work lives.

Teachers spend most of their time before school, during recesses, and after school working and talking together in one "teacher room."

Considering these dimensions leads us to ask questions like, how often do we question the spatial ramifications of where the primary work space of teachers is located? What is the number of hours teachers spend with students as opposed to with other teachers? Have we ever counted those aspects of teacher professional lives within each site?

What is the focus and nature of the conversations around which teachers meet, and what are the boundaries we set? (I think Linda actually mentioned some of the categories, like the labeling of students and how that sets boundaries of expectations for student learning.) Where do teachers look for help in their problem solving? Where are their sources of professional renewal, motivation, and continued growth?

Let me juxtapose these questions now with a few facts of life for Japanese elementary teachers, which forced me to uproot some of my American assumptions in order to appreciate another set of assumptions governing educational practices in these organizational areas.

Space. When you walk into a Japanese elementary school, and I think this is true for middle schools and high schools, all teacher work desks are crowded together in one teacher room. They are clustered by grade level in the elementary school, in the middle school, and I think also at the high school. There might be separate department rooms for subject areas in the middle and high schools, but teachers spend most of their time in this big work space. There's about two feet of room between each cluster of desks, with no room between any of the desks in each cluster. Teachers spend most of their time before school, during recesses, and after school working and talking together in this room. They also would spend their lunch hours there, except that they are required to spend lunch hours with their students in their classrooms. These arrangements say a good deal about

their expectations of one another as colleagues and about the importance of togetherness and developing interdependent working relationships.

Time. Another reason that this unitary work space is important is for daily, morning whole staff meetings. And they have practically daily sub-group administrative meetings, and weekly grade-level meetings.

A complicated committee chart, called the *komubunsho*, outlines the varied responsibilities shared by all teachers, such as administration, student counseling, and curriculum duties. They cover areas like staff welfare, school management, finance, school maintenance, the library, record-keeping, and curriculum and instruction. There are committees for each subject matter as well as for student life guidance, field trips, special events, ceremonies, and school beautification.

Life guidance is a major area where teacher subcommittees oversee issues related to student health, their environment, and nutrition (hot lunch is provided to all students daily in classrooms). Still other subcommittees focus on "encouraging student independence," including issues of safety and the student councils, for which two-person, cross-grade teacher teams take responsibility.

The extensive nature of a teacher's roles and responsibilities adds more time on matters outside the classroom.

This extensive committee framework says a lot about the time commitments and role expectations of teachers. Most committees are interdependent working groups, purposefully assigning a lower-grade and an upper-grade teacher to work together because the issues vary by developmental level. And this necessitates constant communication, facilitated by the open work spaces.

Time plays an important role in other ways: School administrators and teachers are required to rotate to a new school every three to six years. This, again, necessitates communication and interdependence, because school practices vary from one school to another. A veteran teacher sometimes becomes dependent on a less-experienced teacher because the less-experienced teacher knows the community and the school better. On the other hand, the veteran teacher might have particular expertise in math teaching or other aspects of school administration and education from his or her previous workplace. Significantly, this constant rotation builds ever-widening networks of colleagues and conversations across schools. An important aspect of this turnover is that it is fairly predictable and planned in such a way that people may anticipate regular organizational turnover, unlike the turbulence that often besets American schools when principals and teachers come and go.

The extensive nature of a teacher's roles and responsibilities adds more time on matters outside the classroom. For example, all teachers are required to conduct home visits for each student in their classroom, and that may be as many as forty-five students

per classroom, without teacher aides. All teachers, including specialists such as art and music instructors, are required to teach swimming to the students for three weeks of their six-week summer vacation. If any students are caught stealing, even during off hours and off school grounds, the teacher and principal are responsible for apologizing to the store owner and working with the parents to deal with the issue. And they oversee vacation schedules. It astounded me that before every vacation, the teachers distributed attractive vacation schedule forms on which students had to list what they planned to do for every hour of the day during the whole vacation week. The student had to show his or her plan to the teacher for review, and then the parent, student, and teacher had to sign it as a means to set goals and expectations for vacation behavior.

Of course, students evidenced varying degrees of diligence. Some had large blocks of TV time in their schedule, and who knows how closely they followed it, but what fascinated me was the idea that the students had to be aware of time use and how to plan their time. I attempted a similar questionnaire for American students when I came back, and they just looked curiously at the schedule and could not fill it out.

There is a much more holistic outlook on students, and hence on the meaning of education for students in Japan.

What does this say about roles and responsibilities? Japanese teacher-student roles and relationships are not as bounded by space and time as Americans' are. There is not such a clear distinction between vacation and non-vacation time, nor on-campus and off-campus behavior. The separation between a teacher's personal and professional life is similarly blurred. One value the Japanese hold is that as part of the school family, teachers and students enter into a bond, a complex web of relationships, and these bonds last a lifetime.

My advisor from Japan, now 65, has lived in the States most of his life, but he still goes to his elementary school reunion whenever he can. Even these early bonds last forever. My uncle in Japan was 103 when I visited him, and he told me about how happy he was because a former elementary student had just visited him.

So, these broader responsibilities denote not only a different role definition but also an emphasis on whole-person education.

There is a much more holistic outlook on students, and hence on the meaning of education for students in Japan. When I asked teachers there what they would take out of the school day (they work incredibly long hours), they never suggested eliminating things that we call "frills." Or even things we Americans don't consider that teachers ought to do (such as home visits or teaching swimming), because they cannot understand how anyone could teach students well without having a well-rounded view of the students' lives and skills. Besides, swimming and the like are the very activities that make school fun for

students, essential to motivating them for their academic studies.

Similarly, Japanese teachers cannot imagine a school hiring a separate counselor, because a major aspect of their role as teacher is that counselor role. They wonder how one can teach students without forming a strong, trusting relationship first. And, once that bond is formed, then they are the best people to serve in the counselor role. Importantly, this thinking is framed by a cultural notion of self whereby individual self is defined by one's web of relations with others.

One of the most compelling professional development mechanisms resulting from a climate that promotes collaboration is the value placed on teacher research. Research publications for teachers outnumber those for professors of education and universities. But the most exciting professional development mechanism that I participated in was informal teacher research groups. These groups focused on student work. Each teacher would bring collections of all their students' work, such as artwork, a poetry lesson, cassette tapes of their singing, or videotapes of their gym teaching. They would look at the range of products and begin asking questions about the goals of the lesson, how it was introduced, and how they taught it, along with their self-evaluation. I was intrigued when one teacher, listening to a cassette tape asked, "Where were you standing in the room?" The other replied, "Oh, in the front, to the side." And the first teacher said that he thought that was the problem with the students' voice projection as they sang. He continued, "Stand in front of the room. Tell the students to look above your head and sing and you'll hear the difference." The second teacher came back to the next research group and was amazed -- she had tried the suggestion and it had worked.

What was striking to me about this organizational setup is the beauty of the ongoing daily opportunities of conversations about curriculum. As another example, I happened to be in the teacher room when a novice first-grade teacher entered, obviously troubled about her students' drawings of persimmons. She was disappointed that they did not use color more realistically.

I looked at the drawings and thought, in my typical American fashion, that it was wonderful work for first graders. I could tell they were persimmons, and the students had used some different colors. But the veteran teacher immediately asked, "How were the persimmons placed on the table?" And the novice replied, "Oh, well, I put several branches out." And the veteran teacher proceeded, "What was the point of the lesson?" The novice teacher said, "I wanted them to be able to look at the different gradations of color on the persimmons." And the veteran teacher continued, "Well, look at these drawings. The students were concerned with counting. You put out a branch with several persimmons. You can see that they all have the right number on there. If you are concerned with color, just place one on the table. Let them focus. And they will, if you tell them to look carefully."

Fortunately, I was also in the teacher room when she came back with the second attempt. It was amazing that now each persimmon really did reflect a closer look at its

color, and an attempt to see depth, promoting the round shape as opposed to a flat shape.

To me, this incident was memorable in two ways.

First, I realized through this research I was learning how to become a better teacher, in the same way a Japanese teacher learns. I thought, if I only had my own classroom, I could go back to the classroom today and try some of these things. (But since I was in Japan, I just went back to my apartment.)

To do this, teachers needed the regularly structured times to be together and apart. The best learning happens when you need it, with natural opportunities for immediate feedback, and when it occurs in context. Those teachers knew the other students, other school conditions, including each teacher's personality and background, to be able to give the kind of sensitive feedback that the other can hear and incorporate at the right time, act and reflect upon it, and feel good about taking a risk or trying something different. Occasional observations of one another's teaching in classrooms are a typical form of in-house, inservice education in Japanese elementary schools.

inservice education in Japan promotes a culture of teaching that is constantly seeking better ways, and challenging everyone to improve.

The second memorable aspect was that it expanded my notions of what is possible, both in my expectations of first graders and also in the ways teachers can critically assess one another and their methods of teaching in professionally engaging, non-threatening ways. This promoted a culture of teaching that is constantly seeking better ways, and challenging everyone to improve. I would have been perfectly satisfied with all the student work presented at the research group. Yet, the teachers always sought new ways to improve: Imagine how this encourages life-long professional growth and renewal in addition to better student learning.

One fundamental premise that very much impressed me was that the same expectations and standards they held for students, they demanded of themselves in their work arrangements (especially collaboration and mutual teaching and learning). We should not underestimate the power of the congruence between adult world work behaviors and attitudes and those asked of our students. To the extent that the adult work world does not reflect the respect, attitudes, behaviors, and organizational conditions that we expect of students, we should anticipate difficulties.

Cultural Context

One of my major findings is that there is an ongoing, constant, and unremitting focus on relations in Japanese classrooms and in Japanese work. Nobuo Shimahara, a professor at Rutgers, has studied teacher internship and induction (novice teachers' introduction into the classroom in their first year of teaching). The veteran teacher explains,

"Learning the art of teaching entails both the modeling of experienced teachers and sustained efforts to cultivate close, personal relations with children to establish mutual trust. Effective teaching is possible only when that mutual trust permeates the learning environment." One of the most important aspects of modeling in the Japanese context is the value of nonverbal, pedagogical tools. There is a long tradition of learning from the masters, called minarai in Japan, "learning by observation." The Zen ideal is to understand without having to be told. John Singleton summed it nicely in his description of a pottery apprenticeship, where the means for learning is to find the answer without having to ask the question, and to watch without appearing to observe.

In this way, through constant interaction, in the presence of the "masters," one absorbs learning. It is dependent on a long, intimate relationship with the "master." Now, of course, "master" is not quite the term we want to use here in America. But I think the idea is the same, that there is a lot more we learn by observing how we act and react to one another, than from the words we might use to communicate with one another or the students.

Another practice that shows the primary emphasis on relationship building is that students and teachers stay together as a group for at least two years. One principal explained it to me this way: "The first year you look and listen; then in the second year, the real learning can begin." Japanese teachers focus on building relationships and trust as a group before they can imagine teaching out of the textbook.

There are two major cultural concepts at work, which I cannot describe fully here. One is *kokoro,* the Japanese word for "heart," which is the centerpiece of their education. This drives all that is important in education because kokoro is the center of cognitive, physical, emotional, spiritual, aesthetic, and social self. Importantly, they do not have a notion that educators can separate different aspects of ourselves, teach to one and ignore the other, and truly expect to have education occur.

The other is *kizuna,* which is the interpersonal relationship that fosters empathy, characterized by a "touching of the hearts." Kizuna, as one intern explained it, "is the primary condition for teaching and for children to learn from the teacher. If it is not developed, teaching becomes a matter of mechanical process. Kizuna means, to me, developing trust. Without it, discipline would not be effective, and children would not listen to me. Teaching is based on the relationship of trust and classroom management is impossible without trustful relationships." (*From Learning to Teach in Two Cultures,* by Nobuo Shimahara and Akira Sakai.)

Further Thinking

To sum up, I'd like to pose a few questions to ponder. What is the adult learning environment in our schools? What kinds of relations and conversations are encouraged and discouraged by their very organizational set up?

Are there multiple teacher professional communities and student learning communities that in their daily work inspire motivation and life-long learning?

And, what impact would a focus on American kokoro have on our schools? And what would our schools look and feel like if we had a curriculum and philosophy of education that emphasized empathy and a unified heart (kokoro) as a basis for learning the basics?

And, finally, how would our schools have to change in order to emphasize kizuna, and to have schools as places where "touching of the hearts" is the beginning point, the means, and the ends of the educational process?

Thank you. □

Visions of Collegiality: Images From Teachers in China

by Lynn Paine

Lynn Paine is a faculty member at Michigan State University's College of Education, where she specializes in teacher education, comparative education, and sociology of education. She completed her PhD at Stanford University. She has been a high school teacher in the U.S., a university instructor in Taiwan, and done extensive field research in China, England, and the U.S. She conducted an intensive two years of field work in a case study of teacher education in the People's Republic of China in the early 1980s and since that time has made repeated field trips to interview and observe Chinese teachers, students, school administrators, and education officials.

Notions of professional communities can, as Nancy Sato suggests, conjure up images of the "touching of hearts." In my presentation I want to provide additional images and ways of thinking about community, ways of considering how thinking about the heart and touching of hearts need not be described in a single image or considered as embodied in only one form. I want to present stories of other places and other ways in which teachers might seriously care about touching hearts. I will be talking about the kinds of communities that Chinese teachers have constructed. And in considering these stories, we can explore what professional community might mean in a U.S. context.

We can begin with some images from videotapes of research my colleagues and I have been engaged in. My goal in our looking today at these images is to begin thinking about how we imagine and conceptualize teachers' professional communities. I would then

---

*A presentation at AAHE's Fifth National Conference on School/College Collaboration, November 17-20, 1994, in Washington, DC. © American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; ph. 202/293-6440.

like to tell you some stories from my own experience as a teacher, of how I came to experience the place of community in my own development as a teacher. With that as background, I want to tell more stories of my experience, but this time drawing on my own experience watching teachers and working with teachers in China and considering the questions that experience raises for me.

My goal then is to tell stories and paint pictures of ways in which teachers create and are supported by communities. Throughout I will be making comparisons — implicitly and explicitly. But I want to argue that comparative or international research is not really useful for borrowing. It is useful in serving as a mirror to make us notice things about our own lives, experiences, and assumptions we might not have noticed, to allow us the space and time to question some of those, and to think about how we want to reorder some things. In sharing these images of teaching in other places, my goal is not to urge us to think about copying them, but to see how they encourage us to reconceptualize our own images and offer us ways of thinking about possibilities for change.

Images of Community

Let's begin by considering ways in which we enact the notion of community. What does community mean? Community can mean many different things. We talk a lot in the U.S. today about teacher professional communities, about valuing these communities. Let's use an examination of the way we enact community, how it gets imagined, to encourage all of us to rethink what community means, what it entails, and what it requires.

Through our research at the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, we have invited pairs of mentor and novice teachers to videotape the ways in which they work together. Two videos sharply contrast not only in the style of interaction, but also — and more important for our discussion — in how these teachers think about working in and building professional communities of practice. We can look very specifically at the kinds and content of interaction between the novices and mentors. Who sets the agenda? Whose issues are being discussed? Who talks, listens, and interrupts? What is the specific focus of the interaction? What kind of community is being fostered by the interaction? These types of questions help us explore what the community is that's being cultivated in each, and what supports that community. What are the values in that community?

Consider the first vignette, which shows a novice U.S. teacher, a first-year junior high school math teacher, in a meeting — a regular weekly conference — with his mentor teacher. They're talking. The conversation begins with the novice talking about all the paperwork in teaching, and how it keeps him so busy that he doesn't have time to come up with exciting lessons. He tells an extended story about how papers have taken over his house, as he and his wife are both beginning teachers. The mentor agrees that the amount of paperwork is something to get on top of — that he should not be spending so much time on paperwork and grading. "The best use of your time is teaching and planning," the

mentor says, but as she talks, the novice keeps on talking, and moves the conversation to planning the first day of school. The novice asks the mentor what she does on the first day of school, but before she can answer he takes the floor, describing the details of his first lesson of the term.

Throughout the conference together, the novice is doing the majority of the talking, occasionally raising questions for the mentor but often not waiting for the mentor's response before he (the novice) goes on to tell her something he did. As the mentor tries to raise questions that she hopes he'll think about, he regularly interrupts or moves back to discussing his own experience.

From our interviews with this mentor it is clear that she doesn't feel she has either the right or the expertise to "tell" him what to do, but she is very comfortable with the role she has created for herself. She appears as an "encourager" and that's the way she describes her role as a mentor.

Given this construction of her role and the novice-mentor relationship, the novice then relies on his own personal experience as a way of learning to teach. In one conversation, for example, he answers his own question about planning for the first day by recounting what he did. In some sense, learning to teach for this novice is a solo journey, with a "cheerleader" (and she's used that word to describe her role) along the side for emotional support. This clip suggests that the experienced teacher is valued not necessarily as "local guide" or as "educational companion" (Feiman-Nemser and Parker, 1993) who thinks *along* with the novice on his journey, but as cheerleader, who continually offers moral support.

Now that's one way to think about the ways teachers can work together, and the ways in which they can form supportive communities. But it is only one image. A second, contrasting image is that (in the second video) of a Chinese novice and a mentor. The body language is, like with the first, very telling. Watching what's happening is as important in this case as listening.

Let me tell you about this scene. The older teacher, the mentor, is much older than the novice. She is a retired teacher working with a first-year elementary teacher. The mentor has just watched the elementary teacher teaching a first-grade math lesson about addition and subtraction resulting in zero. In the conference that follows this lesson, the mentor teacher does all the talking. The novice is sitting. She looks, to my eyes (and to the views of many American teachers and teacher educators), very passive. The mentor is talking directly about what she observed the novice doing. Sitting next to the novice, the mentor begins the conference by focusing on what she identifies as six strengths in the novice's lesson that day, for example, the colorful teaching aids, the variety of activities, and so on. Then she says, "Even in a very good lesson, there may still be some aspects that can be discussed and improved." She talks about the need to take into account how young children think about abstract numbers. As they talk, she begins then to actually reteach the

lesson. Standing, she moves to the blackboard and uses the teaching aids the novice had designed, imitating a conversation between a teacher and students as she models an alternative way to teach the lesson. She intersperses her modeling parts of the lesson with comments about why she chooses to teach this content in this way, that is, in a way that takes into account how young children think and their need to connect abstract ideas with concrete objects. Throughout, the novice looks on intently.

If we think again about who is talking, who is interrupting, who is, in a sense, holding the floor, these two images couldn't be more different. The first shows the novice as actively setting his own agenda for learning, with a mentor providing emotional support; the second seems to convey a more "traditional" notion of a wise mentor guiding a young novice. But the differences are more complex than simply describing one pair as more learner-centered and one as traditional. In fact, it is the second, "traditional" pair that consistently talks about teaching in terms of students' learning. In their differences, these two pairs represent strikingly different notions of teachers' professional communities. In the first, a teacher's individual autonomy — even for that of a novice teacher — is central. The possibilities for how teachers come together in community are bounded by the individual teacher's need for independence. In the second, concerns about a teacher having a chance to control her or his own teaching are seen as secondary to the task of improving teaching. Teachers' communities get formed around that purpose.

This notion in the U.S. that teaching is highly personal and individualized seems to be a dominant feature in the experience of beginning teachers and how they come to think about teaching.

Certainly the image of becoming a teacher that I had in my mind as I took part in my teacher preparation program in college placed great value on autonomy. I wanted autonomy. I wanted the chance to try things out on my own. I liked the support, the encouragement of my cooperating teacher, but I didn't see that I could gain that much from watching her. That was *her* teaching. That wasn't *my* teaching. And I had to develop my own teaching. Wasn't that the job of a beginning teacher?

I think this notion in the U.S. that teaching is highly personal and individualized is something we see in lots of research about teaching (Little, 1990). It seems to be a dominant feature in the experience of beginning teachers and how they come to think about teaching. And given this as a starting point for many beginning teachers in the U.S., it is not surprising that many share my experience in my first years as a high school teacher — that my most frequent contacts, the people I talked most often with about school, teaching, and learning — in short, my newly created community as a teacher, — were my students. Despite the cheerful encouragement of the other adults around me, I was — apart from my students — learning to teach alone.

Chinese Teachers' Professional Communities

It was, therefore, interesting when I went to China to spend two years studying teacher education in one particular teaching education program to see, first of all, that student teachers weren't alone. They went into student teaching as a group, and they actually worked in small groups or pairs in one classroom, with more than one novice "sharing" a mentor and the mentor's classroom of students. The group I participated with most intensively, each day for their six-week-long practicum, went ten strong each day by bus to the local high school where they were doing their "practice teaching," as the Chinese term would be literally translated.[1]

They also spent very little time actually teaching. That is, they spent relatively little time in the classroom leading the class, facilitating discussion, or even engaged in what was, in that school, the most common instructional activity, lecturing. But they spent a lot of time watching other teachers and a lot of time discussing what they had observed with those teachers. In fact, over a six-week period of student teaching, each of the student teachers I worked with actually taught four periods total. Not four days, but four periods over six weeks. The rest of the time, they were extremely busy. They felt very pressed because they were trying to learn by watching. They were watching kids, watching teachers, talking to teachers, looking at curriculum material, going back to teachers. Not surprisingly the few hours in which each "took the podium" and engaged in classroom instruction were high points for them. But this excitement about time teaching on their own in no way diminished the seriousness they brought to the other activities. They saw these other tasks as part of teaching and hence part of learning to teach. It was these activities that were central to being inducted into that community. For them, that was what it meant to become a teacher.

In China, once teachers became full-time, they entered an organization where working together was part of the fabric of their days, of their weeks, and of their entire career.

Now, that's, I think, a very different notion from how I entered teaching. And certainly, once they became full-time teachers in schools, they entered an organization where working together was part of the fabric of their days, of their weeks, and of their entire career. It was seen as an important piece of teaching. Working together takes many forms — from informal arrangements to the formal organizational structure of the *jiaoyanzu*, or teaching research group. This group is any teacher's primary organizational affiliation. It brings together teachers of similar subject areas in the school to coordinate

---

[1]The Chinese term for "practice teaching," *shixi*, can be broken down into two component words. One root — *shi* — is defined as, among other words, "real, true," while *xi* is translated as "practice," "exercise."

their teaching and work collectively to improve their practice. Unlike departmental structures in U.S. high schools, the *jiaoyanzu* exists at elementary, junior, and senior high schools. And the range of ways teachers within the *jiaoyanzu* work together is far broader than the U.S. department: They study curriculum materials together; they develop an instructional plan for units and even lessons; they research subject matter and explore what are the "important," "difficult," and "key" points in any material for their students; they exchange and examine one anothers' lesson plans; they observe one anothers' teaching; they invite outside "experts" to help them learn about an issue or approach; and more. These groups have regularly weekly meetings, as well as special events — such as inservice workshops, public "demonstration lessons" in which one teacher teaches a lesson and others critique it, and so on. In my many interviews of Chinese teachers, experienced teachers regularly cited the *jiaoyanzu*'s work together as the major influence in their development as a teacher. One high school teacher, for example, explained that even though at the teacher education university "you study your field, everything about it. After studying you feel you know enough. Then as a teacher you feel you don't have enough." For her, it was the teaching research group that allowed her the place to connect theory with practice. She continued:

> *For my first class here, all my colleagues in the teaching research group came, then assessed the class. Then they had me go teach a class for the normal university to observe. This forces you to raise your level. In the trial lesson you go over every part. I was pressed at each step of the way; they press you to improve. You need to push people. It takes about two years, then the school can relax. So I'm very grateful.*

While the *jiaoyanzu*'s impressive range of tasks helps teachers immediately become a part of a vital, active learning community centered around the goal of improving teaching, it is not the only time or place teachers work together. In fact, the daily-ness of Chinese teachers' professional communities is part of what most impresses me, as a foreigner coming with very different experiences. For example, I just came back from another field research trip in China, and I have one vivid memory of something that happens every day in Chinese schools. I had been interviewing some elementary teachers during one class period. Before the interview was quite finished, they suddenly became aware of the time and said apologetically, "We have to leave now. We have to go and teach." And they went off to teach. I stayed in the office I had borrowed for another couple of minutes, rewinding the tape and making sure I had labeled my notes. Then I headed back to the principal's office, where I was to begin another round of conversations. As I walked past classrooms on my way to the office, I passed several classes in session and then passed an almost empty classroom where one of the teachers I had just interviewed was. Seeing her, I realized she had gone off to prepare her lessons. She had said she was

teaching. But in fact she was preparing. But she prepared her lessons in a classroom with a colleague watching her. She was trying out some ideas and the colleague was, in a sense, role-playing the role of students. Rehearsing would be the word that was often used in China. The notion that teachers would help one another in this way is a part of teachers' daily (or ordinary, as opposed to extraordinary) work in China. That she considered preparing part of teaching — even referring to it as such — also points to the scope of the work that is the teacher's and hence the broad boundaries of the professional community.

Chinese teachers work together in formal organizations, in teaching research groups that exist in every school, elementary or secondary, that bring teachers together each week to study teaching, to look at curriculum, to talk about materials they are teaching, to talk about reforms, and to engage in research about particular students' learning, about a subject-matter issue, about a pedagogical reform, or so on. In addition, they're engaged in working together in mentor-novice relations that exist in all schools, not just reform schools, not just elite schools, not just schools trying out new ideas. They work together informally in all kinds of ways. My serendipitous witnessing of the teacher helping out the other teacher prepare her lesson was just one such example of the frequent informal connections that bring teachers together around the practice of teaching. And similar to Nancy Sato's story about Japan, Chinese teachers work together in a lively literature, a sort of literary discourse, of teacher research that's published — teacher autobiographies; teacher biographies; books that talk, for example, about "my best experiences in teaching elementary math."

Chinese teachers often approach their work with assumptions about teaching as a scholarly activity.

In short, teachers in China are members of multiple groups — formal, informal, and even across distance. Together these groups construct and maintain a culture of teaching that encourages teachers in particular ways. While not all Chinese mentors and novices would work together in exactly the same way as the pair I described earlier, (and the collaborating teachers in our study represent a clear diversity of approaches in mentor-novice relationships), it is clear from our research that mentors are helping novices join a community that is authentic and active, that assumes a collective commitment to teaching and to student learning, and that expects teachers to pursue this commitment through frequent collaboration.

Supporting a Notion of Community

What makes this version of community possible in Chinese schools? I think the kind of community that exists for Chinese teachers is supported chiefly by two things — one set cultural and the other organizational and structural. Let me briefly introduce each, beginning with what I see as some dominant and typically unspoken assumptions rooted

in long cultural traditions. Teachers that I had the privilege to observe and/or interview in China were supported by certain cultural assumptions that are very different from the assumptions I brought to my student teaching in New Jersey twenty-odd years ago. These assumptions are related to traditions of knowledge. While the organization of knowledge through the curriculum has changed dramatically over the past several hundred years, basic ideas about knowledge, about teaching's close connections to knowledge and the implications of these for how teachers come together around their practice, seem still supported by these traditions.

First, Chinese teachers often approach their work with assumptions about teaching as a kind of scholarly activity. Teaching has long been connected to scholarship — thanks in part to the influence of Confucius, who was himself a teacher, and to a long tradition of how people became teachers. For more than a thousand years, the Chinese civil service examination — for which people studied the classics intensively — was the source of most elementary teachers. These were aspiring scholars who had devoted years to serious academic study, succeeded in the first level of the highly competitive exam (and hence earned the distinction of scholar) yet failed at the higher levels. Typically they turned to teaching. And it is this tradition that largely has sustained China's teachers in more recent times, when material benefits were short but many respected teaching.

By having a goal outside of their individual selves and one that they share collectively, Chinese teachers are in a position to work together.

Teachers still define their work largely in scholarly terms; often in interviews teachers talked with me about the intellectual demands of their work. A popular saying, one many teachers mentioned to me, puts it this way: "If you want to give a student a cup of water, you need to have a bucket of water." But it is equally important in understanding these assumptions to remember that the Chinese view of scholarship that undergirds teaching is not a narrow, technical one. Rather, teaching is seen as pursuing the Way, as pursuing some kind of truth. As my Chinese colleague Liping Ma has described it, "Scholarship, in Chinese intellectual history, is a process to reach the Tao (the Way) — the ultimate reality of the universe and human society. Classics or texts are the vehicles to carry one to that objective. Therefore, being a scholar at the same time as being a teacher not only provides a common ground for working with colleagues but also a common objective — to pursue 'being with the Way' (as a scholar) and to 'transmit the Way' (as a teacher)" (Paine and Ma, 1993, p. 687). China's classic 9th century treatise on teaching argues that transmitting the Way is the first mission of a teacher.

The result is that teachers see something as higher than themselves or students. Today, even though much traditional thinking has been challenged, Chinese teachers still appear to tend to think there is some goal outside of themselves or their students that they

should work for, some contemporary version of the Way. By having a goal outside of their individual selves and one that they share collectively, Chinese teachers are in a position to work together. I would argue, for example, that it is this view of scholarship and of the goal of teaching that allows that novice first-grade teacher I described to listen to and learn from the mentor without feeling that her lesson is being criticized in ways that personally hurt her. Instead, she and the mentor work together toward the goal of a good lesson about subtraction and addition resulting in zero. It is not her lesson, nor is it the mentor's lesson. Their task is to construct a good lesson.

This kind of collaboration is furthered by a view of teaching as an art. Teachers I spoke with regularly talk about "teaching art." There are many manifestations of the ways in which teachers see their practice as one that fundamentally requires artistry — [from the ritual of the dress rehearsal of lesson plans of a student teacher in front of her colleagues and field supervisors before her first teaching of a lesson; to the more private practice of the experienced teacher teaching in front of a colleague that I observed last fall; to the highly public demonstration lessons, where expert teachers teach a class before a large audience of colleagues from their own school and others]. They acknowledge that much knowledge is needed, but that a really fine teacher is one, like the virtuoso in music, who combines technical wizardry with heart (Paine, 1990).

Such a view of teaching leads the Chinese teachers I have studied to assume that real artistry is recognizable and much to be appreciated. As a result, they do not take offense at knowing that somebody else is a virtuoso, and they might learn from this virtuoso. That art is somehow greater than one person, and is not personally held but collectively appreciated and created. They also assume there is a publicness to the performance of the art; teaching's performance aspects make it inherently public. And this assumption about teaching as art leads to a comfortable acceptance of the "fact" that teaching also involves hierarchical relations. American viewers were often troubled by the implicit hierarchical message of the mentor teacher literally teaching her novice. But whether in this everyday aspect of work together, in the formal titles of "super-rank teacher" (a kind of master teacher, honored for their skill as a teacher) or "model teacher" (recognized for their contributions to a school), or the common label of "backbone teacher" given teachers who shoulder tremendous responsibilities in helping the teaching and learning operation of the school, Chinese teachers regularly live with inequality. The teachers I studied assume that it's perfectly natural to recognize distinctions, which they see as inevitably existing. For them, it is acceptable to not always have flat egalitarian relations. Those are assumptions not widely shared in U.S. teaching. In fact, it was the assumption that an egalitarian relationship is the ideal kind of colleagueship that helped construct the kinds of interactions the U.S. mentor and novice engaged in. The Chinese notion of artistry, with an associated acceptance of difference and even hierarchy, promotes a kind of collective autonomy that allows collaboration that I think is not as clear in the privatized and

personal forms of autonomy we see in the U.S.

In addition to these culturally rooted assumptions about teaching, I believe that the nature of professional community seen among Chinese teachers is also supported by organizational structures. Structures support a community of teachers working through the arrangement of the teachers' office. Teachers don't have their own classrooms. Students have their own rooms, and it is teachers who move between rooms. But they have their offices, where teachers have desks crammed together. They spend most of their day in those rooms, not in classrooms. When they aren't actually teaching a class, they tend to spend time in their offices, which are collections of desks shared by all the teachers in a teaching research group. At any one time, several teachers will be in an office, individually preparing their lessons or correcting student work, meeting with individual students, but also having time and the opportunity to talk — about their lessons, challenges they are facing in their classes, the student who just left and how a teacher might help him, and so on. The space to work together and build a kind of learning community around teaching is enhanced by a schedule that has teachers teaching a relatively limited number of hours a week. While there is variation by level of schooling, subject matter, and the resources of any one school, it is quite common for Chinese teachers to teach somewhere between six and twenty-five periods a week. For the majority of teachers I have interviewed — urban and rural, elementary and secondary, in wealthy and poor schools, and working in seven provinces or autonomous cities (functionally the equivalent of provinces), typically their load was fewer than fifteen periods of teaching a week. What this means, of course, is that teachers actually have time to talk to one another. They have time to exchange ideas, to share materials, to study new curriculum together, even to research a project together. They have the chance to form a meaningful and active community at the center of their practice, not at the fringes of it.

All teachers are defined as learners. Not just for their first year of teaching, but for their life.

They, therefore, talk all the time in fluid ways about individual students, about groups of students, about today's lessons, about broad philosophical issues in teaching. They have time to do that because they don't teach every period of the day. Elementary teachers are more busy teaching, in that they may teach sixteen periods a week. Secondary school teachers might teach as few as four or as many as twelve periods a week. But that means the majority of their time is actually not with students in a whole class teaching. It is either working individually with students, or, chiefly, hanging out and talking and working with other teachers, planning together, looking at students' work together, and so on.

Another key organizational reality of daily life in schools that encourages teachers

to work together is the mentor-novice structure common in most schools. Typically all new teachers are assigned a mentor. The common phrase is that the "old will bring along the young." But even for teachers beyond induction, all are part of a teaching research group. All teachers are, therefore, defined as learners. Not just for their first year of teaching, but for their life.

The last organizational feature that seems especially relevant to teachers' professional communities is one that in the U.S. is often described as depriving teachers of the possibilities for professional action. This is the existence of a national curriculum. China's curriculum has been undergoing much reform of late, but for years there has existed a standard curriculum, set by national and/or provincial education offices, and prescribed with tremendous specificity. While many might argue that having the locus of control over curriculum out of the hands of teachers deprives teachers of an important professional role. While I do not want to argue here either for or against that proposition, what is relevant for our conversation is the way that this standardization[2] creates the possibility for something shared between teachers. Teachers have something in common. Because there's a national curriculum, teachers, in a sense, are given a common language. They know the focus that they have to address, and our research of teachers' interactions shows that it gives them opportunities to talk and a common goal to be addressed in their interactions.

Implications of This Particular Approach to Community

So what are the implications of having these kinds of supports for teachers coming together in the particular ways that Chinese teachers tend to? I would argue that there are several, which produce a strikingly different situation from the kind of socialization into a teaching community that I and many other U.S. teachers have experienced.

For starters, teacher induction is quite smooth in China, compared with the often traumatic process that many teachers here experience. Beginning teachers are joining a real community and one that assumes beginners have a particular place in that community, deserve special kinds of supportive relationships, and need to learn to teach with others, rather than "sinking or swimming" on their own.

Second, this orientation to community means that reforms can be widespread very easily because teachers talk within a school and across schools frequently.

Third, teachers continue to learn and feel rewarded over a lifetime. There isn't the

---

[2]Even today in China, as curriculum is becoming somewhat decentralized, the majority of curriculum decisions — about content, texts, and even key tests — are made outside of the individual school. It is true today that increasing numbers of schools have ventured into the arena of curriculum design, as they publish their own texts and so on. But still the content of learning is basically set by government offices and for the vast majority of schools the specifics of curriculum — the outline of topics, the schedule for teaching them, the choice of textbooks, and so on — are set from above.

same level of burnout and desire to leave the profession after a certain number of years that we find in the U.S. Certainly, lots of people don't want to be teachers in China, because it's hard work and the pay is low. But that's not a function of working a few years and being overwhelmed.

Finally, I think, teachers are able to be part of communities in all schools, not just elite schools, not just rich schools, not just schools next door to universities. In poor rural communities, teachers still have vital, vibrant chances daily to talk to colleagues who care very much about teaching. During fieldwork in one rural community, I was struck how teachers I met who had never had the opportunity to travel beyond their own county, much less their country, were busy studying Bloom's notions of mastery learning and trying to think about what they might mean for their teaching. While their geographic community was quite bounded, their professional community connected them not only to one another, but to teachers and educators around the world.

We're doing a study looking at beginning teachers working with mentor teachers in Great Britain, the U.S., and China, and we see that, in all three cases, the majority of talk about teaching, the majority of interactions between beginning and experienced teachers, centers around teaching, planning, and broad philosophical issues about teaching. Much less attention gets given to discussing testing, homework, assessment, or other issues, although those are also important. But, interestingly, in China (and not in the U.S. or U.K.), the vast majority of time focuses on teaching. We believe this is possible because teachers feel they actually can talk about one another's lessons. In most schools, teachers in fact are required to observe other teachers' lessons — at least twenty lessons a semester. So, you take time to actually go see someone else teach and talk about it. In the U.S., although teaching is a major part of discussion, the majority of discussion is about planning, what you might do. Very little is a chance to reflect on what you've actually done, or to critique one another in constructive ways. Though the U.S. novice and mentor relationship I described earlier is in no way representative of all U.S. novice and mentor discussions, it does illuminate this challenge: How can teachers work together if the scope for their interaction excludes talking critically about what and how they are actually teaching?

I think this raises questions then about how we might want to rethink some of the values we assume in U.S. conversations about collegiality and community. I would argue that China's teachers' experiences mean that we might want to rethink the false dichotomy we've set up in the U.S., that is, thinking that the choice is between having egalitarian relations that foster community or not. I don't think that these are either/or choices. Similarly, my talking with and observing Chinese teachers makes me wonder about the wisdom of assuming,that there is either individual autonomy *or* some sort of group good. Again, this seems to me a false dichotomy, but one that often underlies discussions we have about community issues here. The experience of Chinese teachers is of course unique to them, and one that is itself quite varied and always changing. But as an outsider looking

at these experiences, I am left wondering about how we as teachers might in our unique and changing context here seek ways to find common ground and build common language. □

References Cited

Feiman-Nemser, S., and Parker, M. (1993) "Mentoring in Context: A Comparison of Two U.S. Programs for Beginning Teachers." *International Journal of Educational Research* 19 (8): 699-718.

Little, J. W. (1990) "The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations." *Teachers College Record* 91: 509-536.

Paine, L. (1990). "The Teacher as Virtuoso: A Chinese Model for Teaching." *Teachers College Record* 92: 49-81.

————, and Ma, L.P. (1993) "Teachers Working Together: A Dialogue on Organizational and Cultural Perspectives of Chinese Teachers." *International Journal of Educational Research* 19 (8): 675-697.

An Australian's Focus on Teaching and Learning Through Professional Development

by Diane Snowball

Diane Snowball is an Australian literacy educator who has been invited to North America on many occasions to provide professional development for teachers. Four years ago, she was invited to work at The Writing Project at Teachers College, Columbia University, and as a private consultant. She is past president of the Australian Reading Association and has presented at many literacy conferences throughout the world. Diane has written more than 100 books for teachers, parents, and children and is extremely interested in professional development for teachers. A great deal of her work is in classrooms, teaching alongside the teachers she is supporting.

Let me begin with a story about a teacher from one of the schools where I work in New York City. At the beginning of this school year, one of the grade-two teachers with whom I work said that she was concerned about Mohammed, one of her students, because he couldn't read anything. That was her belief. When I observed the boy's reading and analyzed what he was doing, I discovered that the material he was trying to read was far too difficult, he was really struggling with it. But when he was given books that were more suitable, he displayed the skills of a very competent reader. He was able to self-correct, to work out what made sense, what sounded right, and he felt much more confident about what he was doing. He needed to know that he was using good strategies, that he was doing what good readers do, and that he should continue to use those

---

*A presentation at AAHE's Fourth National Conference on School/College Collaboration, December 5-8, 1993, in Pittsburgh, PA. © American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; ph. 202/293-6440.

strategies. And his teacher needed help with choosing books suitable for Mohammed to read.

When I was visiting the school again the other day, one of the other teachers said that this same boy had recently come to her classroom on an errand. She said, "I noticed that he even walks differently now. He obviously feels really good about himself, and his teacher is very excited and has a very different view of him because she's now seeing him do something he can succeed with."

Failure leads to failure and success leads to success.

I'm not saying that you make the task easier and lower the standards, but you don't set children up for failure either. This particular practice of giving children material that they can't really read is very common, I see it in many schools I visit. It's important to begin where learners are, to let them know what they are successful at and to help them articulate what they can do, what strategies they are using that are worthwhile, and how they can start to apply them in more difficult tasks. The job then is to help students move on rigorously with book after book after book so that they continue to feel success.

I'm not saying that you make the task easier and lower the standards, but you don't set children up for failure either.

This same principle is true for teachers, too. We need to learn about where teachers are, what they're doing that's good, and how we can help them do other things as well. Mohammed's teacher is now thinking about her teaching in a different way. She's, firstly, observing her students and assessing and evaluating in a very useful way; analyzing what they are able to do, what they are confused about, and then teaching with a specific focus in mind; She's working with each child and helping him or her self-monitor because it's important that students become independent learners. She said that she's now learning so much about her students that she didn't know before, and as a result the teaching and learning is improving.

Building Trust

At every level of education, building on what people can do is more important than just following a course and marching on oblivious of what's going on in students' minds.

I wanted to tell you the story of Mohammed for many reasons. One, I think it's terrific that the teacher was willing to ask for help. District Two, where I'm working, has a strong culture of professional development, so it's more likely for teachers to know that seeking help is part of the continuum of learning as a teacher. But it takes a long time to get trust and to build rapport. Sometimes when a district consultant is sent to a school the teachers may think: "What's wrong with us?" But I've been working in the same schools for a year and a half, and I think that the teachers now trust me a lot more than they did

eighteen months ago.

Because I knew that the teachers in Mohammed's school really did need a lot of help at that grade-two level, I asked the district if I could have six substitute teachers provided for a day so that the teachers and I could have some quality time together. Up until then we were snatching a lunchtime meeting or a prep time meeting once a month, according to the union regulations. But having a longer period of time to meet validated the worth of professional development and gave the teachers a chance to begin to form a team, to support one another's learning.

When I met with those teachers I also knew their students very well, and the students knew me. In fact, one of the great things about having a name like Snowball is that the kids remember you. And the principal at that school supported what I was trying to do. When we discovered that the children were being given books that were too difficult for them to read, she went to a lot of trouble to arrange for us to get much more suitable books. Time, support, trust, knowledge of the teachers and children — these factors all make a difference.

The Australian Focus

The purpose of assessment is to inform our teaching.

In relation to the focus for this session, I also want to be able to consider some of the differences and the similarities between what happens here in schools and what happens at home, in Australia.

I know there are many excellent projects going on in the United States, this conference is a testament to that. And not everything is perfect in Australia. To generalize about Australia would also be very foolish, just as it would be to generalize about the United States, so I'm going to share with you one or two of my experiences.

I want to describe one major Australian project that will allow me to make some comparisons with what happens in the schools I work in here. It was a very common, national project that occurred in Australia in all states, at all levels, and in all systems. And actually by telling you about this, I think you'll learn a lot more about some of the things we do in Australia, than my just telling you facts and figures. The fact that I've just said this project occurred in all systems — in public schools, in church schools, and in private schools — is one thing to compare with the U.S. When I worked in the Ministry of Education as a consultant for schools, it would have been illegal for me to have worked with the state schools and not provide the same service in the region for the Catholic schools and private schools. In fact, in any initiative, all of those school systems meet together to consider what they will do — it's a collaborative for all children.

But let's get back to the project I'm describing. It was a project, first of all, focused on language and literacy and then mathematics, and certainly on partnership. It was a

nationwide systematic plan to have all teachers revisit and reflect on their pedagogy and practices, with specific outcomes in mind: that everyone would have a better understanding of how people learn, of the reading and writing processes, and of the type of assessment and evaluation that would inform teaching and learning. (You need to realize that in most states we do not have any formal external tests until year 12. It's not as though assessment doesn't take place; it takes place all day, every day. The purpose of assessment is to inform our teaching. I wouldn't dream of giving a test near the end of a school year, because there's hardly any point in finding out information about students then.)

This professional development project was based on a New Zealand model. It had components such as a weekly 2-hour after-school meeting with a consultant for about 10 to 12 weeks. The sessions always included a lot of discussion, talking about practice, and concluded with something planned for the teachers to try and professional reading to do before the next session. The start of the next session would always start with reflecting on that. The consultant worked within the schools, to support the teachers' work. The consultants from all the states across Australia were specially trained for the program, and they continued with their own professional development, so it wasn't as though: "Now we've trained you, off you go, you now know everything." It doesn't matter what sort of job you have, I think you need to continue your own professional development.

There were many people from higher education areas who were involved in working with these consultants, too, helping to train tutors. The program began nationally for years K-2, and then similar programs were developed for years 3-6, junior high, and high schools, and for all subject teachers. Such a common thread was an important part of the continuum for students' learning, with teachers being able to speak with a common voice, regardless of where they taught, who they taught, and what subject area they taught.

Also, it wasn't as though only the teachers who taught grades K-2 would go to the program that was for years K-2. In fact, in Australia, people don't talk about being "a grade-two teacher." You're a teacher. And just because you're teaching grade two at the moment doesn't mean that next year, or in a couple of years, you won't be teaching a different grade. Years ago, when I became an assistant principal, if you had not taught at all different grade levels then you weren't eligible to become a principal.

Many teachers came together in this program regardless of what grade level they were currently teaching. There was nothing separate set aside for ESL teachers, resource teachers, Chapter 1 (in Australia, we don't even have Chapter 1) people. In the USA, I keep discovering there's yet another person who withdraws children from the classroom. And I'm stunned by it, absolutely stunned by it. There cannot possibly be any continuity for the child. American teachers get less time to meet together than our teachers; it's just shocking to me. And when people here keep saying, "Yes, but what about ESL?" I wonder what the question is for. We don't consider that there are differences in how people learn just

because you're an ESL child. There are things to take into account because of what your first language might be, but the learning process is the same. And we don't want ESL teachers to meet or be trained separately. So the program I'm describing was for everyone.

Similar programs were developed for parents, because you can't start to work with teachers and not think at the same time about how we can help parents to learn just as much about what we're learning. You set yourself up for conflict if you do not involve parents in what you are doing.

The development of the content of these staff development programs was done by a group that included educators from school systems and higher education. Teachers who took part in many of the programs could receive credit for some of the related university courses. Teachers were not paid to go to these courses; in fact, in only some instances would teachers receive credit for going, other than a certificate to say that they had done the course, and that would be something they would add to their own professional development portfolio. The real incentives were the forming of networks with other teachers, learning from and with one another, the support from consultants in a practical way, being part of a team, learning things that were really helpful for working with students in their classrooms, confirming what was good about what they were doing, and learning about new things. It was obviously valued by the system as a whole, because the whole nation was involved in it. It took place over a long period of time, and there was plenty of time for talking and reading during sessions.

This revisiting of pedagogy and practice is important after a short period of time because, regardless of what happens in the initial training of teachers, there's really quite a difference about what teachers notice when they're teaching. I know that it's frustrating when you're working at a university level and you think that students have learned something but they don't seem to really do it when they go out into schools to teach full-time. One spin-off from the postservice training courses was that university people were encouraged to relook at the content of their courses and change what their preservice work was about and how it took place. So involving many partners in the program development had positive effects at all levels.

Here's another piece of information that may interest you about Australia is that any employer with a payroll of over $100,000 per year must set aside the equivalent of 2 percent of that amount to retrain people in its employment. That's regardless of what sort of employer you are, whether you own a drugstore or a school or a factory or an office. The continual retraining of your staff is something that you have to put money aside for. In many instances, a lot of this money goes into literacy programs for parents who are working in factory situations. This makes more sense to me than how I see money spent here. I was shocked the other day at the school where I was working to find out that $300,000 had been spent over three years to try to improve the attendance at the school. That money was being spent on people who would telephone the parents asking, "Why

isn't your child here?" visiting the home to ask "Why isn't your child at school?" and so forth. Attendance at the school had gone up in those three years from 85 percent to 86 percent. What a waste of $300,000! I wish they'd given that money to me, because I would have liked a parent education program that involved the parents in developing their own literacy and appreciating their family literacy. Then I think we might have made a difference to what they think about education and perhaps have changed the attendance of the students as a result.

I think we have much less money to spend on education in Australia, and perhaps that's why we think a lot more about what we're going to do with it. That national program perhaps gives you some ideas about what we do. I've been trying to do some similar work here, to develop teamwork, but I'm aware that teamwork requires time to meet, pleasant places to meet, worthwhile things to talk about. It involves trust, and this is hard to achieve when people in a school don't even know one another as human beings. I'm often struck by the isolation of working in education here, at a school, as a district consultant, and at a university. At home, I'm really used to the practice, even at the university level, of going down to the staff lounge at 11 AM for a cup of tea or coffee with colleagues from the many faculties.

I think we have much less money to spend on education in Australia, and perhaps that's why we think a lot more about what we're going to do with it

In an Australian school, every teacher stops at the same time, goes to the staff room, and has a cup of tea or coffee. And the principal would be part of the group, meeting and chatting, talking about personal interests or about school or education matters; both are seen as important. The ritual is also there at lunchtime and sometimes for drinks after work on a Friday night. These are the times when people get to know one another. You cannot believe how crucial these times are. It's such social gatherings that I've taken for granted. There is no place and time for people here in the U.S. to get together as human beings, so I'm not surprised that many teachers do not work together as a team.

Continued Teamwork

Now I'm not saying that the culture of Australia should be transferred here. But I do know that the conditions for productive learning need to exist for all educational personnel. This includes finding some way to form caring communities who can get together in pleasant surroundings.

We tried to do some of that in a summer institute in District Two, when we asked teachers to come together from schools throughout the district. For a school to be included, at least five teachers from the school and an administrator had to be willing to attend. If the

parents could come, they were welcome, too. We met at the Metropolitan Museum, in the meeting rooms there, so that it would be a pleasant place to be.

We gave the teachers plenty of choice; we said, "We want you to think about what you would like to learn about for this week and how you would like to learn it." Many were shocked by this, because they were so used to going to institutes where someone just talked at them all day. They weren't used to thinking for themselves. By the end of the week, though, they said that what they valued the most was having to think about what they wanted to learn about, to have time to meet with their colleagues, time to read, time to talk, sessions to go to that really related to their questions, and that they made the choices. Many of the schools sent fifteen to seventeen people to that institute, which is quite a large number in the summer, and so the teamwork started. But, of course, then the school year got under way, and there was no place in the school for people to meet again and no time set into their normal day-to-day program to meet. They're trying to find their own ways to do that, but I think that's going to be a major struggle as this year goes on.

But it's certainly been useful for Mohammed, the boy I first started talking about, because the teacher I mentioned was from one of the schools involved in the summer institute. I can already see a change in the teamwork that's happening at that school. The grade-two teachers now meet with me on their prep times, which in the past wouldn't have happened. So, things start in small ways and continue to grow. □

About AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) is a national organization of more than 8,500+ individual members dedicated to improving the quality of higher education. AAHE is higher education's "citizen's organization," where faculty, administrators, and students from all sectors, plus policy makers and leaders from foundations, government, accrediting agencies, and business can address collectively the challenges higher education faces.

AAHE members share two convictions: that higher education should play a more central role in national life, and that each of our institutions can be more effective. AAHE helps to translate those convictions into action through its programmatic activities, publications, and conferences. Member support enables AAHE to initiate special projects — like the Education Trust — on a range of issues to promote effective change at the campus, state, and national levels.

Benefits of AAHE membership include *Change* magazine and the *AAHE Bulletin*, discounts on registration at AAHE's conferences, discounts on AAHE's publications, and more.

AAHE's Other Special Projects

The **AAHE Assessment Forum** advances the thoughtful practice of assessment aimed at improving the quality of undergraduate education.

The **Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Project** works to help campuses implement the best practices — and avoid the pitfalls — of CQI.

The **AAHE Teaching Initiative** works to bring new emphasis to the importance of undergraduate teaching and learning.

The **AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards** focuses on the redefinition of faculty priorities and institutional expectations for faculty in the context of a rapidly changing academic workplace.

AAHE's Technology Projects seek to mainstream the effective use of technology for instructional purposes.

About the Education Trust

The Mission

The Education Trust was created within the American Association for Higher Education to work toward simultaneous reform of the educational system on all levels, from kindergarten through postsecondary. The Education Trust endeavors to provide

strong leadership in the effort to strengthen the connections between K-12 and higher education at the local, state, and national levels. Through its various initiatives, the Trust aims to increase significantly the number of poor and minority students in the nation's urban communities who enter and successfully complete four years of higher education.

The Trust's current goals include:

- Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and school districts working together with the broader community to improve the achievement of urban youth — especially minorities and the poor — through systemic reform strategies.

- Connecting reform-minded educators with one another and with education activists from business and community groups.

- Focusing higher education institutions on needed changes in the way they do business in order to support K-12 reform and improve student outcomes at the postsecondary level.

- Improving government policy to provide support for collaborative systems reform.

The History

AAHE has a long history in the area of school/college collaboration. At its 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, Ernest Boyer and others spoke of the need for schools and colleges to work together toward education reform. In 1984, inspired by *A Nation At Risk* and a new wave in education reform, AAHE dedicated that year's National Conference to school/college collaboration.

Since then, AAHE has committed itself to encouraging collaboration through a variety of initiatives, projects, annual conferences, and publications. AAHE formalized this commitment in 1990 with the establishment of the Office of School/College Collaboration. In 1993, to reflect the need for K-12 and higher education to form strong and effective systemic linkages, the office was expanded and reorganized as the Education Trust.

Current Initiatives of the Education Trust

Community Compacts for Student Success (CCSS). Administered by the Education Trust for The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Community Compacts for Student Success program engages participating urban communities in developing and implementing collaborative, standards-based, systemic strategies to increase student success.

A Compact is an agreement among an area's educational (K-12 and postsecondary), business, and community leaders to commit themselves to working together for six to eight years to put in place a set of systemic reforms to increase dramatically the number of poor and minority students who complete high school, enroll in postsecondary education, and persist to completion. The Compact network comprises the following communities: Birmingham, AL; El Paso, TX; Hartford, CT; Philadelphia, PA; Providence, RI; and Pueblo, CO.

The Network currently is not accepting new members, but information about the Compacts and their strategies is available from the Trust.

K-16 Initiative. The K-16 Initiative builds on lessons learned from the Community Compacts for Student Success. It aims at increasing higher education's involvement at the national, state, and local levels in developing and carrying out systemic strategies to improve education at all levels, kindergarten through college graduation. K-16 participants work together nationally, as well as in their own communities, to define common educational principles, shape education policy, and plan and implement action agendas.

Participation in the K-16 Initiative is open to all communities willing to collaborate and able to bring together leaders from K-12, higher education, and the broader community in a mutually designed effort to improve student achievement, with special focus on minorities and the poor.

Title 1 Reform Network. Title 1 (formerly Chapter 1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is the federal government's largest contribution to public education, affecting more than 5.5 million students in more than two-thirds of the nation's schools — including all of those schools attended by high concentrations of poor students. The Education Trust served as the home for the work of an independent Commission on Chapter 1, which issued a 1992 report, "Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty," that significantly influenced the reauthorization of the ESEA during the 103rd Congress.

As a result of the Commission's work, the new Title 1 has shifted from a remedial, add-on program to an engine for improving whole schools serving poor children. The Education Trust will continue its Title 1 work by monitoring the federal government's implementation of the act and by assisting local communities in understanding and using the new opportunities available in the Title 1 program.

National Conference on School/College Collaboration. Since 1990, AAHE has sponsored an annual conference that attracts some 700+ participants to discuss ways of increasing student achievement through partnership activities. Conference objectives include: providing a forum for administrators and faculty in schools and colleges to share information, learn about and discuss new ideas, and meet colleagues from across the

country; addressing current issues in collaboration; and introducing cutting-edge ideas and strategies in K-16 reform.

Partnerships for Standards-Based Professional Development of K-12 Educators. This new effort, supported by a grant from the Department of Education, is centered on the Community Compacts of Philadelphia, Pueblo, and El Paso. The three Compacts will develop a model of standards-based professional development, beginning with community-wide discussions of standards, aimed at producing content standards. Teachers in each city will then examine student work to establish performance standards, and finally design appropriate curriculum and assessments to achieve the standards. As work proceeds, information about progress will be available in the Trust's newsletter, *Thinking K-16* (see below), and a major dissemination roll-out of the model is planned for other cities.

Rethinking College Admissions. Elementary and secondary education systems are hard at work developing *new standards* for what all students should know and be able to do, *new assessments* that measure student performance against those standards, and new ways of displaying this information on the high school transcript. As these efforts proceed, institutions of higher education are coming under increasing pressure to align their *admissions* processes with these standards and assessments so that students, parents, and teachers will get consistent messages about what is important. Fortunately, a few institutions of higher education are already well along in the process of adopting performance-based admissions standards and can help to point the way for others. With support from the Knight Foundation, the Education Trust is taking a close look at this cutting-edge work and is producing a report aimed at helping other colleges and universities — together with nearby school districts — to rethink admissions.

Resources Available From the Education Trust

Publications. AAHE's Publications Department offers an inventory of books on issues of school/college collaboration. For ordering information, contact the AAHE Pubs Order Desk (x11). The Education Trust also publishes a quarterly newsletter, *Thinking K-16*, and a variety of manuals and materials.

Information exchange. The Education Trust staff offers its experience and knowledge in school/college collaboration through technical assistance to individuals, schools, postsecondary institutions, and organizations.

Audiotapes. Most annual conference sessions are audiotaped and available for purchase.

Academic Alliances. During 1987-1991, AAHE was home to the National Project in

Support of Academic Alliances, funded by the MacArthur Foundation. Academic alliances are local collaboratives between school and college faculty who teach in the same discipline or interdisciplinary area of study. The Project has ended, but the Education Trust continues to work as an information center to broaden the advocacy base for academic alliances.

Staff:
Kati Haycock, *director*
Nevin Brown, Ruth Mitchell, Stephanie Robinson, Paul Ruiz,
and Carol Stoel, *principal partners*
Eleanor Dougherty and Amy Wilkins, *senior associates*
Wanda Robinson, *manager, meetings and publications*
S. James Guitard, *manager, government and network relations*
Kristen Burnette and Vinci Daro, *project associates*
Akiba Solomon, *project assistant*
Sonya Palmore-Wilson, *administrative coordinator*
Crystal Pinkney, *administrative secretary*

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
202/293-6440
Fax: 202/293-0073

You can also reach the Education Trust's staff members via e-mail:
Kati Haycock: khaycock@capcon.net
Nevin Brown: nbrown@capcon.net
S. James Guitard: jguit360@aol.com
Ruth Mitchell: ruthm29682@aol.com
Stephanie Robinson: srobinsn@capcon.net
Wanda Robinson: wrobinsn@capcon.net
Paul Ruiz: pruiz@capcon.net
Carol Stoel: cstoel@capcon.net

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
ph. 202/293-6440, fax 202/293-0073